

Application No. 10/099,870
Filed: March 14, 2002
TC Art Unit: 2825
Confirmation No.: 4461

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the present application. Claim 10 and 13 are cancelled, without prejudice, herein. Claims 1, 8, 11, 12 and 14 are amended herein. Accordingly, claims 1-9, 11-12 and 14-17 will be pending upon entry of the instant amendments.

Support for the amended claims can be found throughout the specification and encompassed by the scope of the claims as originally filed. In particular, support for the amended claims 1, 8 and 12 can be found, for example, at least, from original claims 10 and 13. The amendments to claims 11 and 14 are made to depend from an appropriate pending claim. No new matter has been added.

Any amendments to the claims should in no way be construed as acquiescence to any of the Examiner's rejections and were done solely to expedite the prosecution of the application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the claims as originally filed in this or a separate application(s).

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that claims 10, 11 and 13-15 will be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the intervening limitations.

Specification

The disclosure was objected for lacking appropriate headings. Applicant has amended the specification thereby overcoming the objection.

With respect to Fig. 3, this figure was objected to because the reference numerals in the figure were not mentioned in the

Application No. 10/099,870
Filed: March 14, 2002
TC Art Unit: 2825
Confirmation No.: 4461

specification. The specification is appropriately amended herein to label the corresponding object to the reference numerals. Based on the context of the description of Fig. 3 in conjunction with the description of Figs. 4 and 5 in the same paragraph (page 8, lines 1-15), it is clear that reference numeral 20 applies to the substrate and the reference numeral 21 applies to the camera capsule described for Fig. 3. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claim 1 was rejected for the phrases "such as" and "for instance." Applicant has amended claim 1 to delete the phrases thereby overcoming the rejection to claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-7.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 12, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hunter (U.S. Patent 6,244,121).

Applicant respectfully traverses the foregoing rejection.

As now amended, the present invention is directed to an inspection system for a process equipment for treating substrates, e.g., semiconductor wafers, or flat panel displays, which includes a wireless sensor for inspecting the interior of the process device, the sensor being provided with a transmitter to transfer a signal, during inspection of the interior of the process device, to a receiver located outside the process device, the wireless sensor being arranged on a support having substantially the same

Application No. 10/099,870
Filed: March 14, 2002
TC Art Unit: 2825
Confirmation No.: 4461

dimensions as the substrates to be treated, wherein the sensor includes a microvideo camera.

Hunter fails to anticipate each and every element of the claimed invention. Without being bound by this argument alone, Hunter fails to anticipate the sensor including a microvideo camera (claims 1, 8 and 12). Additionally, the Examiner asserted that claims 10 and 13 would be deemed allowable if rewritten in independent form; claims 10 and 13 are directed to having the sensor include a microvideo camera. Therefore, Applicant considers that the currently pending claims are now allowable.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunter in view of Madsen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,174,205).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 7 is now dependent on an allowable base claim thereby obviating the foregoing rejection. However, in addition, Applicant considers that Hunter, either alone or in combination with Madsen et al., would fail to teach or suggest the claimed invention. Hunter or Madsen et al. fails to teach or suggest a sensor to include a microvideo camera. Moreover, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not think of combining Hunter with Madsen et al. to come up with the claimed invention. The cited references are nonanalogous art and there is no requisite motivation or suggestion to make the modification in the manner suggested by the Examiner. "Bluetooth" technology may have been well known, but Hunter provides no teaching or suggestion to use such technology for wireless communication or even for Hunter's

Application No. 10/099,870
Filed: March 14, 2002
TC Art Unit: 2825
Confirmation No.: 4461

technology. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the foregoing rejection.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, entry of the amendments and remarks presented herein, reconsideration and withdrawal of all the rejections and allowance of application with all pending claims are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

OTTO CORNELIUS JONKERS

By: 

Charles H. Gagnebin III
Registration No. 25,467
Attorney for Applicant(s)

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN,
GAGNEBIN & LEOVICI LLP
Ten Post Office Square
Boston, MA 02109
Telephone: (617) 542-2290
Telecopier: (617) 451-0313

CSK/knr
297954-1